

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 15-18 are pending in this application. Claims 7-9 are currently withdrawn. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to address the teachings of Morganti, claims 15-18 are added and claims 10-14 are canceled. Support for amended claim 1 and new claim 15 may be found in the original specification at, for example, paragraph [0032] and Figure 2. Support for new claims 16-18 may be found in the original specification at, for example, original claims 2, 3 and 5, respectively. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Afzali and Examiner Bryant at the interview held December 12, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); (c) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,728,506 ("Morganti").

Claims 1-3 and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Morganti in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,690,738 ("Boelkins").

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the above rejections.

Claim 1

None of the applied references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an oiling roller assembly, including an oiling roller, a roller shaft about which the oiling roller rotates; and at least one cap unit disposed on an end face of the roller shaft, and wherein the at least one cap unit comprises a flange portion at an end of the at least one cap unit that comes into contact with the oiling roller, and a recess portion at an opposite end of the at least one cap unit, wherein the oiling roller has a porous formed body made of compressible material, and wherein the roller shaft extends an entire length of the oiling roller and the oiling roller is mounted on the roller shaft, as recited in claim 1.

Morganti discloses a nose section 62 (alleged roller shaft) that forms a leading step on a journal 60 (alleged cap unit). However, as described in column 6, lines 8-16 of Morganti and as clearly shown in Figures 9 and 10 of Morganti, nose section 62 (alleged roller shaft) is mounted on journal 60 (alleged cap unit) and does not extend the entire length of the wick roller 31 (alleged oiling roller) so that the roller is not mounted on a shaft that spans the entire length of the roller. In contrast, claim 1 requires the roller shaft to extend an entire length of the oiling roller and for the roller to be mounted on such shaft. Thus, as Figures 9 and 10 of Morganti clearly show that the nose section 62 (alleged roller shaft) does not extend the entire length of the wick roller 31 (alleged oiling roller), nowhere does Morganti teach or suggest the roller shaft extending an entire length of the oiling roller, as required in claim 1.

Further, the Patent Office relies on Boelkins as allegedly disclosing a roller assembly wherein an oiling roller includes a porous and compressible felt cover in order to facilitate the overall uniformity and control dispersion of a liquid. However, even if Boelkins discloses

this feature, Boelkins fails to remedy the deficiencies of Morganti in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of claim 1.

New Claim 15

None of the applied references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest An oiling roller assembly, including an oiling roller, a roller shaft about which the oiling roller rotates; and at least one cap unit disposed on an end face of the roller shaft, and wherein the at least one cap unit comprises a flange portion at an end of the at least one cap unit that comes into contact with the oiling roller, and a recess portion at an opposite end of the at least one cap unit, wherein the oiling roller has a porous formed body made of compressible material, and wherein the at least one cap unit compresses the compressible material of the oiling roller where it contacts the oiling roller, as required in new claim 15.

Morganti discloses a wick roller 31 (alleged oiling roller) that has a layer or cover of wicking material 42 (e.g., fabric such as high temperature felt) with an elongated, cylindrical, permeable ceramic core 41 (see Morganti, column 4, lines 29-33). However, as shown in Figures 9 and 10 of Morganti, journal 60 (alleged cap unit) does not come into contact with the alleged compressible material (wicking material 42), but in fact comes in contact with ceramic core 41. Ceramic by definition is a material that is hard, brittle, heat and corrosion resistant. In contrast, new claim 15 requires the at least one cap unit to be compressed against the compressible material of the oiling roller. Thus, as Morganti discloses a journal 60 (alleged cap unit) placed against ceramic core 41 and not against a compressible material as required in new claim 15, Morganti fails to teach or suggest each and every claim feature of new claim 15.

Further, Boelkins discloses a perforated cylinder 50 closed by an end cap 54 (see Boelkins, Figure 7). However, the perforated cylinder 50 of Boelkins is made of sheet metal having numerous perforations extendible thru its peripheral wall and therefore, is not

compressible material (see Boelkins, column 4, lines 41-48). As such, Boelkins fails to remedy the deficiencies of Morganti.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 15 and dependent claims thereof, are patentable over the applied references. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) are respectfully requested.

Rejoinder

In response to the Restriction Requirement, claims 7-9 were withdrawn. However, in light of these withdrawn claims depending from claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that upon allowance of claim 1, claims 7-9 should be rejoined and similarly allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3, 5-9 and 15-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin K. Jones
Registration No. 56,809

JAO:KKJ/can

Date: December 21, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 24-0037